

and hear the news being led off by the story: Another American soldier killed and more wounded.

Just so people understand the gravity of this, a wounded soldier is not a flesh wound in all cases. Some of these soldiers, our best and brightest in America, have lost limbs. Their lives have been damaged and changed forever. They are just listed as "wounded." But those wounds go deep and those families and those soldiers will bear them for many years to come.

That is where we are in this war in Iraq: This President ignoring the economic realities of America with the loss of jobs, ignoring what has happened because of the economic policy that has failed, refusing to acknowledge the cost of health insurance and these astronomical profits of the pharmaceutical companies, caving in to the special interests on Capitol Hill, ignoring the real people, the small businesses, the families across America who ask us to stand up for them. Instead, we are going to send \$87 billion to Iraq to try to build an economy there.

Sadly, we should start here. Let's build America's economy. Let's try to make sure we focus on what we need as a nation. This administration has not done that. The American people will awaken to that. Congress should as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. There are a number of strikes going on as we speak. The latest started in Los Angeles with all the transit drivers. That is a result of problems with health care. The problem with automobile manufacturers, the other strikes going on in America involve one issue: health care. So the Senator's statement regarding health care and this administration's total neglect is one of the most important domestic issues facing America today.

I appreciate very much the Senator's statement.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to the Senator from Nevada, through the Chair, this is a pervasive issue. It used to be you could separate on trade and health care, business on one side and labor on the other. If I took you into a room and did not tell you the origin of a group in a room and you listened to a business group on these issues of trade and health care, you would think you were in the labor group. If you went to a labor group, you would expect to hear some concerns about what trade policy in this country has done and what health care does.

I find over and over again that these people are despairing. They are despairing because they have been told by this administration, let the marketplace solve the problem. The marketplace has not solved the problem.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1689, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill, (S. 1689) making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Byrd amendment No. 1818, to impose a limitation on the use of sums appropriated for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

Byrd/Durbin amendment No. 1819, to prohibit the use of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Funds for low priority activities that should not be the responsibility of U.S. taxpayers, and shift \$600 million from the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund to Defense Operations and Maintenance, Army, for significantly improving efforts to secure and destroy conventional weapons, such as bombs, bomb materials, small arms, rocket propelled grenades, and shoulder-launched missiles, in Iraq.

Reid (for Stabenow) amendment No. 1823, to provide emergency relief for veterans health care, school construction, health care and transportation needs in the United States, and to create 95,000 new jobs.

Bond/Mikulski amendment No. 1825, to provide additional VA Medical Care Funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Dorgan amendment No. 1826, to require that Iraqi oil revenues be used to pay for reconstruction in Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The democratic assistant leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator STEVENS is not here. I am covering the floor for Senator BYRD this morning. I am sure Senator STEVENS would have no objection to the Senator from New Mexico offering an amendment. I yield the floor for the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 1830

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank my colleague from Nevada.

Madam President, so there is no question about the opportunity for others to speak, I was asked if I would describe my amendment first and then at the end of my description I will ask to set aside the pending amendment and send my amendment to the desk. That is how I will proceed.

I intend to offer in a few minutes an amendment on behalf of myself, Senator LUGAR, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator BAYH, Senator CLINTON, Senator DURBIN, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LINCOLN, Senator SMITH, and Senator REID. This is an amendment to honor our service men and women in Iraq who are serving far from home, far from family, far from friends.

Let me indicate from the title of the amendment that I intend to send to the desk what it would do: to authorize the award of the Iraqi Liberation Medal as a campaign medal for members of the Armed Forces who serve in Southwest Asia in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom.

These service men and women, as we all know, have left the security of this country and their home behind to provide freedom and security for those who have not known it for many years. The human cost has been substantial, over 300 American fighting men and women will never come home. There are over 1,200 who will return wounded, far higher than previous conflicts.

I have a chart that demonstrates the grim statistics, showing the casualties our military has incurred in recent conflicts. In Operation Desert Storm, with which we are all familiar, the casualties, total deaths were 382, killed in action, 143, and the wounded were 467. In the Kosovo campaign, there were 16 deaths. In Operation Iraqi Freedom, as of last week, there were 196 killed in action, 309 total deaths, and 1,268 wounds.

So the casualties have been significant. This is not a minor military activity. We have over 130,000 troops in the region. They remain to ensure that those who died and those who were wounded did not suffer and die in vain. They are also there to build a new Iraqi nation and to provide stability and freedom in that nation.

The liberation of Iraq is turning out to be the most significant military occupation and reconstruction effort, clearly, since the end of the Vietnam war and perhaps even before that. Despite their sacrifice and courage, these brave men and women will not, under current policy, be specifically recognized for their service in Iraq. Instead, the Department of Defense has decided to award them a Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

This issue was drawn to my attention by an article that appeared in the Army Times and the Navy Times and the Air Force Times called "One Size Fits All?" "The Pentagon plans to award one medal for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and for any future campaigns related to the war on terrorism."

I believe this is a mistake in policy, that our military personnel deserve better. Accordingly, my colleagues and I are offering this amendment to correct the mistake by ensuring there is authorized an Iraqi Liberation Medal in lieu of this Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

As all who have paid attention in the Senate know, some of us did not agree with the administration's decision to proceed in Iraq when it did, but clearly we have all been united in our support of the troops. Young men and women, both active-duty personnel and National Guard and Reserve, have come forward and done their duty. That is clearly the essence of patriotism, and we all respect that.

They continue to serve even though they do not know when they will be returning to their families and to their communities. They continue to serve despite the tremendous hardships they face and despite the constant threat to their lives.

The President, of course, has agreed entirely with this view of the exemplary service our men and women have provided. He has made many statements to that effect, and there is no partisan disagreement on any of that.

Let me put up another chart in the Chamber.

During Operation Desert Storm, service members received three separate military decorations for their service: the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; the Liberation of Kuwait Medal, given by the Government of Saudi Arabia; and the Liberation of Kuwait Medal, given by the Government of Kuwait. Those are all three depicted on this chart.

In the case of Kosovo, our service men and women received the NATO Service Medal and the Kosovo Campaign Medal. And those two medals are depicted on this part of the chart.

In the case of this current conflict in Iraq, the proposal by the administration is to give them the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, and that would apply to Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom or any operation in the Philippines or any future global war on terrorism operation.

The policy as it now exists would say that if you are in the military and you are directed to duty in one or more of these operations, you get this generic medal which indicates you are part of the global war on terrorism, which we know is of indefinite duration and which we know is not limited by any geographic limitation.

There is a difference—a substantial difference—between an expeditionary medal on the one hand and a campaign medal. We only need to look at an excerpt from the U.S. Army Qualifications for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal and the Kosovo Campaign Medal. In order to receive the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, you do not need to go to war, you only need to be “placed in such a position that, in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, hostile action by a foreign armed force was imminent even though it does not materialize.” So that is an expeditionary medal.

To earn the Kosovo Campaign Medal, there was a higher standard. A military member had to either “[b]e engaged in actual combat, or duty that is equally hazardous as combat duty, during the Operation with armed opposition, regardless of time [spent] in the Area of Engagement.”

Many within the military agree there is a significant difference between an expeditionary medal and a campaign medal.

According to the Army Times:

Campaign medals help establish an immediate rapport with individuals checking into a unit.

An expeditionary medal does not necessarily denote any combat or any real connection to that particular area of potential combat. A campaign medal is designed to recognize military personnel who have risked their lives or are risking their lives in combat.

Obviously, all of us want to see proper recognition given to our young men and women who are in Iraq, including Army SP Joseph Hudson from my home State of New Mexico, from Alamogordo, NM. He was held as a prisoner of war. The Nation was captivated, and particularly people of my State were captivated, as we watched Specialist Hudson being interrogated by the enemy on videotape. Asked to divulge his military occupation, Specialist Hudson stared defiantly into the camera and said: “I follow orders.” Those of us with sons and daughters were united in worry with Specialist Hudson’s family. The entire Nation rejoiced when he was liberated. He is just one of many who deserve this special recognition I am arguing for today.

We have also asked much of our Reserve and National Guard personnel. The reconstruction of Iraq clearly would not be possible without the commitment and sacrifice of the 170,000 Guard and reservists who are currently on active duty. As recently as this last week, an additional 10,000 troops from Washington State and North Carolina were activated for service in Iraq.

I think this is a straightforward amendment, one for which I hope we can have very strong support. I am very pleased that it is being proposed as a bipartisan amendment. My colleagues and I are committed to appropriately honoring the 200,000 or so heroes who have served to date or are serving in connection with the effort in Iraq. We believe current administration policy does not properly honor those personnel, and therefore we propose that in lieu of this Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, a new decoration that characterizes the real mission in Iraq—one that is distinctive and honors their sacrifice, something in the nature of an Iraqi Liberation Medal—be provided.

Some will argue that Congress has no business legislating in this area. But I point out there is ample precedent for what we are proposing. Congress has been responsible for recognizing the sacrifice and courage of our military forces throughout history. Congress has had a significant and historically central role in authorizing military decorations. Our Nation’s highest decorations were authorized by Congress. Those include the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Air Force Cross, the Navy Cross, the Army’s Distinctive Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Flying Cross. All of those were authorized by Congress.

We have also authorized campaign and liberation medals similar to what is being proposed here in many cases. A partial list includes the Spanish War Service Medal, the Army Occupation of

Germany Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Berlin Airlift Medal, the Korean Service Medal, and the Prisoner of War Medal, in addition to the medals I have referred to already.

The men and women of our military are doing their jobs every day in Iraq. We should do our job by honoring them appropriately with a medal that is specific to their sacrifice and to this campaign in Iraq.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BAYH, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 1830.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize the award of the Iraqi Liberation Medal as a campaign medal for members of the Armed Forces who serve in Southwest Asia in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to President George W. Bush, Operation Iraqi Freedom was “fought for the cause of liberty, and for the peace of the world...” and “to free a nation by breaking a dangerous and aggressive regime”.

(2) The military victory in Iraq has been characterized by President George W. Bush as one of the “swiftest advances in heavy arms in history”.

(3) There are more than 130,000 Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines of the United States serving in the Iraqi Theater of Operations, far from family and friends, and for an unknown duration.

(4) Since the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom, almost 300 members of the Armed Forces of the United States have died in Iraq and nearly 1,500 have been wounded in action.

(5) Congress has authorized and Presidents have issued specific decorations recognizing the sacrifice and service of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Korean War, the Vietnam conflict, and the liberation of Kuwait.

(6) Current Department of Defense guidance authorizes the award of only one expeditionary medal for overseas duty in Afghanistan, the Philippines, and Iraq.

(7) The conflict in Iraq is significant enough in scope and sacrifice to warrant a specific military decoration for the liberation of Iraq.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF AWARD OF CAMPAIGN MEDAL.—The Secretary concerned may award a campaign medal of appropriate design, with ribbons and appurtenances, to any person who serves in any capacity with the Armed Forces in the Southwest Asia region in connection with Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(c) NAME OF MEDAL.—The campaign medal authorized by subsection (b) shall be known as the “Iraqi Liberation Medal”.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CONCURRENT AWARD OF GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM EXPEDITIONARY

MEDAL.—A person who is awarded the campaign medal authorized by subsection (b) for service described in that subsection may not also be awarded the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal for that service.

(e) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—The award of the campaign medal authorized by subsection (b) shall be subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe.

(f) REGULATIONS.—(1) Each Secretary concerned shall prescribe regulations on the award of the campaign medal authorized by subsection (b).

(2) The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall not go into effect until approved by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) are uniform, so far as practicable.

(g) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means the following:

(1) The Secretary of the Army with respect to matters concerning members of the Army.

(2) The Secretary of the Navy with respect to matters concerning members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Navy.

(3) The Secretary of the Air Force with respect to matters concerning members of the Air Force.

(4) The Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning members of the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will not ask for the yeas and nays at this point. At an appropriate time, I will ask for the yeas and nays. It is important that the Senate go on record in support of the awarding of a medal of this type. I hope we can have a very strong vote on its behalf.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been informed that the Department of Defense does not support the Bingaman amendment, the pending amendment No. 1830. It has bipartisan support.

Let me explain to the Senate why there is opposition from the Department. At the request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Presidential Executive Order 132–89, dated March 12, 2003, authorized global war on terrorism, Expeditionary and Service Medals for members of the United States Armed Forces who have served in military expeditions to combat terrorism around the world as defined by Department regulations on or after September 11, 2001.

This was created and tailored to recognize both combat and noncombat operations not just in a single campaign or country but worldwide. To be eligible for the Expeditionary Medal, service members must have served within the area of eligibility. However, initially approved operations for Expeditionary Medals are Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Battle stars for the Expeditionary Medal are provided for service mem-

bers who engaged in combat against the enemy in the area of eligibility. Because antiterrorism operations are global in nature, the area of eligibility for an approved operation may be deemed to be noncontiguous. The combatant commander has authority to award medals for personnel deployed within his or her theater. There is a separate medal called the Service Medal that provides commanders the flexibility of recognizing supporting personnel and will not be restricted by geographical boundaries. Unlike the Expeditionary Medal, the Service Medal includes not only support for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom but also Operation Noble Eagle and airport security operations from September 27, 2001, to May 1, 2002.

The Department urges against the establishment of an Iraqi Freedom Medal for two reasons. First, it is redundant with the global war on terrorism medal in its purpose. Second, it is divisive in that it values participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom as being more worthy of individual recognition than Operation Enduring Freedom. In other words, there are people who have served in Afghanistan and Iraq, there are people who have served in Afghanistan and not Iraq, and Iraq and not Afghanistan.

The whole concept of this global war against terrorism is that there are also combatants in the Philippines and in Indonesia and other places throughout the world. I don't know how many there are, but I have been told some of the global war on terrorism medals have been awarded.

The problem about the Bingaman amendment is, what happens to those people who received those medals? Do they give them back? Do they also get an Iraqi medal of freedom? What happens to the people from Afghanistan? As I understand it, I could be wrong, but it covers only the Iraqi liberation medal.

Mr. REID. That is true.

Mr. STEVENS. But not Afghanistan.

So the best advice I can give the Senate is this: If the Senator from New Mexico wishes a vote, I certainly will not oppose that and will join in requesting a vote. However, I will say no matter what happens here, whether the Senate approves or disapproves, the subject matter will have to be dealt with in conference because it is a matter that has been raised, and it is of great significance.

I talk too much about my own service in World War II, which was sort of insignificant, but I got a CBI medal—China, Burma, India—but I spent only a day or two in India and an hour or two in Burma. We all thought we should have had a China medal, but the powers that be gave us a China-Burma-India medal. The powers that be right now are the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is not a political issue is what I am trying to tell the Senate. This is an issue that arose out of an initiative

from the Joint Chiefs of Staff themselves, is what I understand.

They decided this current situation is so global in nature that people are moved from one area to the other in terms of expertise and need, that there ought to be a medal for the period we are in right now which is really a global war on terrorism, and as such I am inclined to support that concept. I will vote against the Bingaman amendment. But I have a feeling it will pass because I think everyone would like to be on record now of recognizing the need for medals.

That would be my last comment to the Senate. The Senator from Hawaii is not here, but I do remember on two occasions when I have been with him when he has raised the question with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Where are the medals?

People, as they come home from a combat such as we are involved in now, may or may not be eligible for the Purple Heart. The concept of these other medals, however, has not settled down yet. I think as our men and women in the Armed Services start coming home, they should be recognized for their service with something of distinction, such as the medal of the type we are talking about, either the Global War on Terrorism Medal or the Expeditionary Medal, or the Service Medal, whatever it is. As a matter of fact, if they have been there, I would give them all three. Redundancy is not a crime in terms of medals for service in uniform in combat, as far as I am concerned. But I do think it has to be sorted out. The people who already have the Global War on Terrorism Medal, who fought in Iraq, may want the Iraqi medal. On the other hand, people who fought in Afghanistan may very much want the Global War on Terrorism Medal. It is something I think really requires pretty cautious thought in the Department of Defense and the Senate. I intend to join in asking for a vote on the amendment at the proper time and hope we can vote on it right after the vote that is set at 2:30 today, and then move on with further business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the hour of 12:30 is fast approaching. I am wondering if we could enter into an agreement now that that vote occur immediately following the vote on genetic nondiscrimination?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would so move and ask unanimous consent it be in order at this time to order the yeas and nays.

Mr. REID. And that Senator BINGAMAN have 2 minutes prior to the vote to speak on his amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like 2 minutes on each side.

Mr. REID. Of course. With no amendments in order prior to the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. No other motions in order, and up or down on the amendment. But I would like 2 minutes for

the Senator from New Mexico and for myself, and the vote to occur after the already scheduled vote. I ask that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order to request the yeas and nays.

Mr. STEVENS. I do request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The request is agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Senate will stand in recess at 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, that is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the legislation pending before the Senate is the emergency supplemental bill dealing with Iraq; and that has to do with security: security for our troops, security in Iraq. But there are other issues of security that affect us in our country: issues of security that deal with protecting our homeland. We provide critically needed funds to try to prevent another terrorist attack on our soil.

So I was surprised, as I was traveling the other day, to hear the President talk about using Homeland Security assets to track down Americans who are traveling in Cuba illegally and punishing those Americans.

As you know, it is currently illegal for Americans to travel in Cuba, except by a license given by the U.S. Treasury Department. The fact is, though, that there are many Americans who do go to Cuba. Many go because they think it is their right as Americans to travel freely, and in many cases, they go because they are not aware that they are breaking any rules.

I believe the travel ban unfairly punishes American citizens. In an attempt to take a slap at Fidel Castro, it ends up restricting the right of American people to travel. Many of us here think that makes no sense at all.

When I heard the President describe his interest in having Homeland Security people track down American tourists traveling in Cuba, I thought I would come to the floor of the Senate, and talk about a grandmother named Joan Slote. As you can see from this picture, Joan is in her mid 70s. She is a Senior Olympian. She is a bicyclist. She bicycles all over the world. She is in her mid 70s. And she joined a bicycle tour of Cuba, with a cycling club from Canada. They bicycled in the country of Cuba for, I believe, 8 or 9 days.

Joan Slote came back to this country from Cuba, and later on she was off to Europe where she was on a bicycle tour. While she was in Europe, she learned her son had brain cancer, and

she rushed back to the United States, and just stopped at her home for a minute, and then rushed down to be with her son and attended to her son, who later died of brain cancer.

When she finally came back to her home, apparently there was a letter waiting for some long while from the U.S. Treasury Department that said: Oh, by the way, you traveled to Cuba with a bicycle club from Canada, and that was illegal, and so we are administering a \$7,630 fine.

So Joan Slote, this mid 70s grandmother—no threat to this country for sure—is one of those Americans who is now being punished by the U.S. Government for travel in Cuba.

Now, we have folks down at the Department of the Treasury in an organization called the Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC for short—and that is the organization that is charged with tracking money to terrorist groups to protect our country. But instead of focusing on that critically important mission, OFAC officials are tracking retired grandmothers who are riding a bicycle in Cuba and try to slap them with a big fine.

And now the President says: Oh, by the way, I would like to get more involved here. I want the Homeland Security Department tracking these people who are traveling to Cuba.

I thought our interest here in the Senate was to fund a Homeland Security agency to protect our country against the threats of terrorists, not to chase little old grandmothers who take a bicycle trip to Cuba.

Incidentally, OFAC finally negotiated with a \$2,000 fine for Joan Slote. After I intervened, they said: All right, the \$7,600 fine we will reduce to \$2,000. So she sent them the money. But do you know what they did then? They sent a collection agency after her and told her they were going to begin to garnish her Social Security payments. Why? I do not have the foggiest idea. I guess it is just a bureaucratic mess.

But I was just thinking as I was driving down the road the other day, hearing President Bush say we have to get tough on Cuba, we are going to take Homeland Security people to go chase American tourists in Cuba.

The interesting thing is, Americans can travel virtually everywhere. You can travel to Communist China. Yes, that is a communist country. You can travel to Vietnam. Yes, that is a communist country. But you cannot travel to Cuba. And we are going to use Homeland Security assets—people, time, money—to go track down little old ladies who are bicycling in Cuba?

Are we really threatened by the poor guy who took the ashes of his dead father to Cuba, which was his father's last wish, to be sprinkled on the lawn by the church where he ministered in Cuba many years before?

Yes, they tracked that fellow down for taking his dad's ashes to Cuba. They fined him \$7500.

It is story after story after story like this.

And now the President wants people in Homeland Security tracking Americans to punish Americans for traveling in Cuba.

What about homeland security? How about tracking terrorists? Let's track terrorists, not retired grandmothers who are riding bicycles.

Marshall McLuhan once said: I don't always believe everything I say. I thought to myself, that must surely have been the case in the White House when the President announced we are going to take Homeland Security Agency resources and start tracking American citizens so we can slap big fines on them for traveling into Cuba. This is preposterous. What on Earth can the President be thinking?

I have talked to Joan Slote. She is just one of many examples of ordinary U.S. citizens who meant absolutely no harm. I have talked to another retired grandmother from Wisconsin. She traveled to Cuba innocently and rode a bicycle as well. I have talked to many such folks. I held a hearing on this. I had people show up who described their travel to Cuba. They did not know it was illegal but—guess what—they have the Federal Government after them.

In an attempt to slap Fidel Castro, we are punishing American people. We are restricting the right of the American people to travel. And now the President gets into the act, which, I assume is about Florida politics, and says, oh, by the way, I want to divert Homeland Security assets to see if we can't get tougher on people like Joan Slote.

This issue involves wasted resources, that could and should be spent on real threats to our homeland security. Homeland security is about protecting this country from the threat of terrorists, not chasing senior citizens riding around on bicycles.

That is where the homeland security assets ought to be employed. That is where the Department of the Treasury assets ought to be employed, protecting our country from the threat of terrorist attacks, not chasing Joan Slote. My hope is that perhaps they will have another meeting at the White House and rethink this and finally do the right thing, at least meet some basic test of common sense.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:30 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH.)

GENETIC INFORMATION NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will resume